

## REMARKS

By this response, Applicants have submitted an IDS that includes various office actions, responses, and corresponding references for related applications to ensure that the Office considers these documents in conjunction with the current application. Additionally, Applicants have amended claims 24-25, 32, 36, 42, and 44-45. As a result, claims 24-47 remain pending in this application. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the objections and rejections and reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims, or claims that are potentially broader in scope, in the current and/or a related patent application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, the Office rejects claims 24-28, 30-39, and 41-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,967,728 (Vidyanand). In order to maintain a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Office must show that a single reference discloses each feature of the claimed invention. In particular, the Office must show that "[t]he identical invention... [is] shown in as complete detail as is contained in the... claim" to maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102. See, e.g., MPEP § 2131, citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). To this extent, as recently reiterated by the Federal Circuit, in order to anticipate a claimed invention, the reference must "disclose[] within the four corners of the document not only all of the limitations claimed but also all of the limitations arranged or combined in the same way as recited in the claim." *Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.*, No. 2007-1565, pp. 17-18 (Fed. Cir. 2008). Applicants respectfully submit that the Office fails to present such a showing.

For example, with respect to claim 24, the Office fails, *inter alia*, to show that Vidyanand describes previewing a document by generating a print file, transmitting the print file over a network, and receiving image data based on the transmitted print file as claimed therein. In support of its rejection, the Office cites Figs. 5-10 and col. 7, lines 61-67 as allegedly disclosing a method of previewing a document. Initially, Applicants note that these figures generally describe reusable and transferable printer preferences. See, e.g., Figs. 5-10; col. 4, lines 1-18; Abstract. Applicants submit that the reusable and transferable printer preferences of Vidyanand are unrelated to previewing a document.

During a telephone interview conducted with Applicants' undersigned attorney on September 17, 2008, the Examiner indicated that Vidyanand allegedly discloses communicating printer driver preference settings from a server to a client. Further, the Examiner contends that these printer driver preference settings would be used on the client in order to preview the document. Even if, *arguendo*, the Examiner accurately states the teachings of Vidyanand, Vidyanand fails to disclose all of the limitations arranged or combined in the same way as recited in claim 24. In particular, claim 24 recites generating a print file based on a document, transmitting the print file for processing by a server over a network, and receiving image data on the client, which is based on the transmitted print file. Applicants note that any communications from the client to the server in Vidyanand in order to request printer driver preference settings would not include transmitting a print file from the client for processing by the server. Additionally, the print driver preference settings that are sent from the server to the client in Vidyanand would not include image data that is based on a transmitted print file.

Fig. 9 and col. 7, lines 61-67 of Vidyanand do include a page layout thumbnail preview 94 and a brief discussion thereof. However, Applicants note that the general setting interface 62

is included in a user interface 50 that is generated by a printer driver 14, which is disclosed as being located on a client computer 12. See, e.g., Figs. 1-4 and 9; col. 7, lines 44-47; and col. 7, line 61-col. 8, line 4. Further, Applicants note that Vidyanand does not discuss how the thumbnail preview 94 is generated. As a result, Applicants submit that the printer driver 14 of Vidyanand generates the thumbnail preview 94 without any communications over a network, as is known in the prior art.

In contrast, Applicants' invention of claim 24 previews a document by generating a print file based on the document, transmitting the print file for processing by a server over a network, and receiving image data based on the transmitted print file on the client over the network.

The Office cites col. 5, lines 45-64 and col. 8, line 59-col. 9, line 52 of Vidyanand as allegedly disclosing receiving image data on the client over the network, the image data being based on a print file that is generated using a print driver on a client and transmitted for processing by a server over a network as in claim 24. However, Applicants note that the cited portions of Vidyanand merely discuss a set of printer driver preferences, which are required to successfully print a print job at a networked computer (col. 5, lines 45-64), and translating printer driver preferences for one printer for use on another printer (col. 8, line 59-col. 9, line 52). Applicants note that neither of the cited portions of Vidyanand include any discussion about image data, let alone receiving image data, which is based on a transmitted print file, on a client over a network as in claim 24.

To this extent, while the Office contends that Vidyanand allegedly discloses communications between a client and a server, which may subsequently enable a print preview, the Office fails to contend that Vidyanand discloses the transmission and receipt of any of the particular data of claim 24 (i.e., print file and image data) as part of previewing a document.

For example, in response to Applicants' previous arguments, the Office states that Vidyanand allegedly discloses "send[ing] the print file to a server for storage or printing... [and] describe[s] how the host computer creates the print job by using the print preference that allow the user to send the file to a network printer thru a server..." Final Office Action, p. 6, lines 1-4. However, Applicants note that sending a print file to a network printer thru a server is not relevant to previewing a document. In contrast, such an action would be performed as part of printing the document, which would occur after any preview of the document.

Further, in response to Applicants' previous arguments with respect to receiving image data based on a transmitted print file on the client, the Office states that Vidyanand allegedly "describe[s] how data can be send (sic) to a client over the network from a server or storage or other clients." Final Office Action, p. 6, lines 10-11. However, Applicants note that the Office merely contends that any data can be sent to a client. In contrast, claim 24 recites receiving image data on the client over the network, the image data being based on a transmitted print file. Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure of the transmission of data that is distinct from the data of claim 24 fails to disclose all of the limitations of the receiving arranged or combined in the same way as recited in claim 24.

Still further, in an Advisory Action dated 16 October 2008, the Office states that "fig. 4 clearly *suggests* that image data *can be* communicated between the devices through the network 22, and image data can be transmitted to a printer as the file to be printed." Advisory Action, item 11 (emphasis added). Applicants note that such a statement explicitly acknowledges that Vidyanand fails to anticipate claim 24. In particular, the Office must show that Vidyanand *discloses* not only all of the limitations claimed but also all of the limitations arranged or

combined in the same way as recited in claim 24. In this case, the Office merely alleges that Vidhanand suggests certain features of the claims.

Additionally, to the extent that the Office is alleging the such communications are inherent in Vidyanand, Applicants have amended the claims to clearly state that the transmitting and receiving are performed in response to the generating and transmitting, respectively. Applicants submit that such actions cannot be found to be inherent in any system.

In light of the above-stated reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claim 24 and claims 25-28, 30-31, and 44-47, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being anticipated by Vidyanand.

With respect to claim 32, Applicants note that the Office relies on its interpretation of Vidyanand as allegedly teaching all the features of claim 24. To this extent, Applicants hereby incorporate the arguments presented above for claim 24. As a result, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 32 and claims 33-35, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being disclosed by Vidyanand.

With respect to claim 36, Applicants note that the Office relies on its interpretation of Vidyanand as allegedly teaching all the features of claim 24. To this extent, Applicants hereby incorporate the arguments presented above for claim 24. As a result, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 36 and claims 37-39 and 41-43, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being disclosed by Vidyanand.

Further, the Office rejects claims 29 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Vidyanand in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0043753 (Grohs). With respect to claims 29 and 40, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office fails to show that each and every feature of the claimed invention is taught or suggested by the Office's

proposed combination of Vidyanand in view of Grohs. Applicants note that the Office relies on its interpretation of Vidyanand as allegedly teaching all the features of claims 24 and 36, from which these claims respectively depend. To this extent, Applicants hereby incorporate the arguments presented above for claims 24 and 36. Further, Applicants note that the combination of Vidyanand and Grohs, even if, *arguendo*, proper, fails to address the deficiencies of Vidyanand cited above with respect to claims 24 and 36. As a result, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 29 and 40 as allegedly being unpatentable over the combination of Vidyanand and Grohs.

Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John LaBatt/

John W. LaBatt, Reg. No. 48,301  
Hoffman Warnick LLC  
75 State Street, 14th Floor  
Albany, NY 12207  
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone  
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile

Dated: 15 November 2008